

INCOMING TELEGRAM

Department of State

ACTION COPY

55-L

Action

EUR

Info

RMR

SS

W

G

SP

C

SAE

L

IO

INR

H

SECRET

Control: 12097

Rec'd: April 18, 1959
5:35 p.m.

FROM: London

1959 APR 20 AM 7 23

TO: Secretary of State

NO: 5444, April 18, 7 p.m.

PASS DEFENSE

FROM HILLENBRAND

LIMIT DISTRIBUTION

REDEPTTEL 9216

001

8/3/60

No reply required
Vigilant / GER

In addition to information contained EMBTEL 5390 re para 9 (C) of British tactics paper, Department will have noted discussion at April 17 working group session reported EMBTEL 5438. British may have had two objectives in mind in proposing language in question:

1. To hint at, without spelling out, possibility under certain circumstances of taking certain limited security measures in central European area not specifically linked to full agreement on reunification, and
2. To raise possibility that might face western Foreign Ministers of being confronted with Soviet proposals at conference for some such limited arrangement.

British are obviously playing this very gingerly in desire to avert any major conflict with allies, and efforts on our part to draw them out have not been particularly successful. We have, of course, stressed American position that European security measures must be linked to German reunification, but this has merely elicited comment that we must be prepared to face possibility Soviets will insist on discussing such measures divorced from reunification. German delegation has likewise discussed privately with British with apparently same results, but so far has had no reaction from Bonn in view of initial delay in transmitting British

SECRET

UNLESS "UNCLASSIFIED"
REPRODUCTION FROM THIS
COPY IS PROHIBITED

DECLASSIFIED

Authority

NND 887404

NARA Date 1-8-70

PERMANENT

RECORD COPY • This copy must be returned to RM/R central files with

-REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

162.00/4-1859

Name

Destroyed in RM/R

Da

nat

SECRET

-2- 5444, April 18, 7 p.m., from London

British tactics paper.

British have been stressing point that their emphasis on limited security arrangements in European zone (as 5437) is intended to counteract what they believe will be inevitable pressure from proponents of disengagement. This argument, it will be recalled, was made several times by Selwyn Lloyd during recent Washington meetings, and there would appear to be element of sincerity in this. How far British actually are prepared to go, or how precisely they have at this point formulated their thoughts, is not clear. During private discussion yesterday with Hancock we attempted to draw him out as to whether British actually had a clear position which they might be holding back. He gave impression that Foreign Office at least was still operating somewhat in dark, having only certain general observations made by Prime Minister to go on. He implied that, even in Macmillan's mind, concept was still very general and had never been put down on paper in very specific terms.

We will, of course, endeavor to obtain further information this subject, but believe it unlikely that British will give any additional indications during present session which would elucidate intent behind para 9(C). In fact, it seems likely that British have already gone farther in disclosing their thoughts than they had perhaps originally intended at outset of London meetings.

WHITNEY

UE/9

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED

Authority NND 887404
R. 42 NARA, Date 1-8-90

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES